

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICHARD SEPULVEDA,
Plaintiff,

v.

MOHAMED GAZALI, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [22-cv-01899-VC](#)


**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE
COURT SHOULD EXERCISE
SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION**

Federal courts may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over a state law claim “in exceptional circumstances.” 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(4). When a “high-frequency” litigant asserts a California Unruh Act claim in federal court alongside an ADA claim, this will typically constitute an exceptional circumstance that justifies dismissal of the Unruh Act claim. *See Arroyo v. Rosas*, 19 F.4th 1202, 1211–14 (9th Cir. 2021); *Garcia v. Maciel*, 2022 WL 395316, at *2–5 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2022). The plaintiff is therefore ordered to show cause why this Court should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim.

The plaintiff must respond within 21 days of this order. Failure to respond will result in a dismissal of this action with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 12, 2022



VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge